

**Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and
NEPA Adequacy (DNA) #OR134-06-DNA-007
For Renewing Grazing Allotment # 3600749**

Note: The signed Conclusion at the end of this worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLMs internal analysis process and does not constitute an appealable decision.

**A. Spokane BLM District, Wenatchee Resource Area
Lease/Serial/Case File No. 3600749**

Proposed Action Title/Type: Grazing Lease Renewal/Custodial Allotment

Location of Proposed Action: This allotment is located along the Columbia River approximately 15 miles west of the town of Mansfield, in Douglas County Washington. The allotment is part of the Douglas County Scattered Tracts Management Area (See attached map). Legal Description of the lands is as follows:

T27N R23E	Sec 1: Lot 4, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec 2: Lots 1, 2,3,6,7, S $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, N $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$, SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec 11: W $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, E $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, NW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$
T28N R23E	Sec 35: Lots 9 & 10

Description of the Proposed Action: The proposed action is to address a grazing lease renewal for grazing allotment # 3600749 for a period of 10 years (3/2006-3/2016). This allotment is a “Custodial” allotment with 775 acres of public land connected to private land owned by the lessee. The allotment was renewed in 2006 in accordance with Sec. 325, Title III, H.R. 2691, Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2004 (P.L. 108-108), which was enacted on November 10, 2003, this grazing permit or lease is renewed under Section 402 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1752), Title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (7 U.S.C. 1010 et seq.), or, if applicable, section 510 of the California Desert Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 410aaa-50). In accordance with Public Law 108-108, the terms and conditions contained in the expired or transferred permit or lease have been incorporated into this permit or lease and shall continue in effect under the renewed permit or lease until such time as the Secretary of the Interior completes processing of this permit or lease in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations, at which time this permit or lease may be canceled, suspended, or modified, in whole or in part, to meet the requirements of such applicable laws and regulations.

The number of cattle and AUMS may be adjusted to an equivalent use, contingent on review and approval of the Interdisciplinary Team and the Field Manager.

Applicant (if any): Carl Enders

B. Conformance with the Land Use Plan (LUP) and Consistency with Related Subordinate Implementation Plans

☐The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUPs because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

- Spokane District Resource Management Plan (RMP) Record of Decision (ROD)/Rangeland Program Summary (May 1987). Authorization for grazing on this allotment is identified on page 49 of the RMP/RPS.

☐The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions) and, if applicable, implementation plans decisions:

C. Identify the applicable NEPA documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

Spokane District Resource Management Plan (RMP)/Final EIS (August 1985).

Other documentation relevant to the Proposed Action:

- Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitats and Species - 1997 Databases
- Washington Natural Heritage - 1998 Database
- Washington Office of Archaeological and Historical Preservation - 2003 Database
- Spokane District 2003 Archaeological Survey Database and files.

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed?

Yes. This grazing allotment is specifically listed in Appendix E of the Spokane RMP/FEIS for use of 86 AUMs, which is the same as the proposed renewal.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA documents appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, resource values, and circumstances?

The range of alternatives in the RMP/FEIS appropriately reflects current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values.

3. Is the existing analysis adequate and are the conclusions adequate in light of any new information or circumstances? Can you reasonably conclude that all new information and all new circumstances are insignificant with regard to analysis of the proposed action?

An interdisciplinary team conducted a review for any new information, studies, and analyses that would materially differ from earlier analysis in the RMP/FEIS.

Along with the provision in the LUP for monitoring of allotments and implementing changes to grazing use as mitigations to minimize impacts to other resource values, the existing analysis is

still considered adequate.

There is no new significant information regarding the proposed action

4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA documents continue to be appropriate for the current proposed action?

The methodology and analyses used in the Spokane RMP/FEIS are still considered appropriate.

5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA documents? Does the existing NEPA document sufficiently analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action?

The impacts of livestock grazing, which specifically included this allotment, were analyzed in Chapter 4 - Environmental Consequences (pages 79-92) in the Spokane RMP/FEIS, and remain substantially unchanged.

6. Can you conclude without additional analysis or information that the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current proposed action are substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA documents?

Cumulative impacts are identical to, and within the parameters of, those identified and accepted for Allotment 3600749 grazing use, since the proposed action was specifically analyzed in the Spokane RMP/FEIS.

7. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA documents adequate for the current proposed action?

The Spokane RMP/FEIS and its ROD (including the Rangeland Program Summary) were distributed to all interested publics and other government agencies for review. Since the subject grazing leases are identified in the land use plan, which went through all of the appropriate and legally required public/agency review, at the time public involvement was considered adequate. The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) was consulted, but individual tribes were not.

The BLM issued consultation letters regarding the grazing lease #0749 renewal on July 3, 2007. Letters regarding this allotment and a list of other leases expiring in 2007 were sent to the Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP), the Yakama Indian Nation, and the Colville Confederated Tribes. On July 9, 2007 the DAHP responded, concurring with the definition of the area of potential effect (APE). BLM did not receive a response from either the Yakama Indian Nation or from the Colville Confederated Tribes.

As of August of 2008, Cultural Resource Surveys were completed. Letters regarding these surveys were sent to the Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP), the Yakama Indian Nation, and the Colville Confederated Tribes on September 15, 2008. On September 18, 2007 the DAHP responded, concurring with the determination of effect. BLM did not receive a response from either the Yakama Indian Nation or from the Colville Confederated Tribes.

No other specific public involvement, or interested public status (under the grazing regulations at 43 CFR 4100.0-5), has been requested for these allotments, except from the grazing lessee who has been involved in all planning processes pertaining to this allotment.

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis: Team members conducting or participating in the preparation of this worksheet are identified on the cover sheet of this DNA.

F. Mitigation Measures: None

CONCLUSION

☐ Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the existing NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

Note: If one or more of the criteria are not met, a conclusion of conformance and/or NEPA adequacy cannot be made and this box cannot be checked

_____/S/ Karen Kelleher_____
Karen Kelleher, Wenatchee Field Manager

____10/30/08_____
Date